

Celaeno. Bandel & Boletzky (1988) called the genus *Celaenoteuthis* for unknown reasons. Since 1950, four authors have used *Kelaeno* (and variants, including *Celaeno*) and four authors *Muensterella* (including *Münsterella*). It follows that there is no consistent use of the generic name *Kelaeno* (including *Celaeno*) for the genus of coleoid cephalopods proposed by Münster in 1842.

7. Since there is confusion in the meaning of *Kelaeno* and also in its spelling, it would be best to reject *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842 as a junior homonym of *Kelaeno* d'Orbigny, 1841, and to use the unambiguous replacement name *Muensterella* Schevill, 1950 (with *Kelaeno arquata* Münster, 1842 as the type species).

8. The family name KELAENIDAE (OR CELAENIDAE) based on *Kelaeno* (or *Celaeno*) has a similar inconsistent use in the literature. It would be preferable to replace it by MÜNSTERELLIDAE Roger, 1952 in its corrected form MUENSTERELLIDAE.

9. For the reasons given above, I support Donovan's proposals regarding *Acanthoteuthis* but oppose the conservation of *Kelaeno* Münster, 1842. *Muensterella* Schevill, 1850 should be used rather than *Kelaeno*.

Additional references

- Bandel, K. & Boletzky, S. von. 1988. Features of development and functional morphology required in the reconstruction of early coleoid cephalopods. Pp. 229–246 in: Wiedman, J. & Kullmann, J. (Eds.). *Cephalopods — present and past*. Schweizerbart'sche, Stuttgart.
- Engeser, T. 1986. Beschreibung einer wenig bekannten und einer neuen Coleoiden-Art (Vampyromorphoidea, Cephalopoda) aus dem Untertithonium von Solnhofen und Eichstätt (Bayern). *Archaeopteryx*, 4: 27–35.
- Engeser, T. 1987. Nachtrag zur Nomenklatur der coleoiden Cephalopoden des 'Solnhofener Plattenkalks' (Untertithonium). *Archaeopteryx*, 5: 65–67.
- Kretzoi, M. 1942. *Necroteuthis* n. gen. (Ceph. Dibr., Necroteuthidae n.f.) aus dem Oligozän von Budapest und das System der Dibranchiata. *Földtani Közlöny*, 72: 124–138.
- Orbigny, A.d'. 1842–1846. *Paléontologie Française. Terrain Jurassique*, vol. 1. Masson, Paris.
- Walther, J. 1904. Die Fauna der Solnhofener Plattenkalke. Bionomisch betrachtet. *Jenaer Denkschriften*, 9: 135–214.

Comments on the proposed conservation of *Lironeca* Leach, 1818 (Crustacea, Isopoda) as the correct original spelling (Case 2915; see BZN 51: 224–226)

(1) L.B. Holthuis

Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

A few remarks in defence of the name *Livoneca* Leach, 1818 and in opposition to the application seem to be called for.

As Drs Williams and Bowman have pointed out, in Leach's original publication (1818) the spelling *Livoneca* and its French equivalent *Livonèce* appeared consistently (4 and 5 times respectively). No explanation was given for this name nor for the others in the group, among which are *Nelocira*, *Cirolana*, *Conilera*, *Rocinela*, *Canolira*, *Anilocra*, *Olencira* and *Nerocila*. It was only much later that White (1857, p. 250) pointed out the connection with the name *Carolina* in the cases of *Cirolana*,

Conilera and *Rocinela*, which 'were formed by Dr. Leach from the word Carolina by transposing the letters, and by changing one of the *a*'s into an *e* in the two latter names'. There is no evidence in the original publication that *Livoneca* was an inadvertent spelling error and it thus has to be considered an available name.

For more than a century (1818–1931) the name *Livoneca* was used practically exclusively. I know of only two authors who used *Lironeca* then (White, 1847, p. 109, and Miers, 1876, p. 106); neither gave any reason for the use of this spelling. The original spelling *Livoneca* appeared in all major and widely consulted handbooks dealing with cymothoid Isopoda published in the 19th century and in the first half of the 20th.

The first explicit challenge to the spelling *Livoneca* known to me was by Monod (1931, p. 5), who remarked in a footnote 'depuis la création du genre (1818), seul Miers [1876, as mentioned above] a écrit *Lironeca* au lieu de *Livoneca*'. Monod continued that a typographic error was evident in Leach's original paper and that under the *Règles Internationales* the spelling had to be corrected to *Lironeca*. This was understandable, since the *Règles* current in 1931 did not exclude circumstantial evidence. However, in the Codes published in 1961 and later such evidence is excluded (see Article 32 of the current edition) and so *Livoneca* has to be treated as the correct original spelling; Monod (1931) is the author of the unjustified emendation *Lironeca*.

As shown by Drs Williams & Bowman, *Livoneca* was the dominant spelling until Bowman (1960) reintroduced *Lironeca*. I have several times remonstrated to Dr Bowman and Dr Monod about the 'error of their ways' but to no avail. Dr Bowman's authority is such that other isopod workers have followed him in using *Lironeca*, but use of *Livoneca* has continued to this day although on a much reduced scale.

Personally I do not think it right to suppress an available name which was practically the only one used from 1818 to 1931, which was dominant until 1960, and which has had some usage since then. I consider that *Livoneca* Leach, 1818 should be put on the Official List of Generic Names but that no further action is necessary. However, the referral of the case to the Commission by Drs Williams & Bowman was a good idea since it will settle the status of the two spellings and end the controversy.

A final although minor point is that Fowler (1912, p. 278) and not Gurjanova (1936) was the first to designate *L. redmanii* as the type species, and this should be recorded in the eventual Opinion.

Additional references

- Bowman, T.E. 1960. Description and notes on the biology of *Lironeca puihi*, n. sp. (Isopoda: Cymothoidae), parasite of the Hawaiian moray eel, *Gymnothorax eurostus* (Abbott). *Crustaceana*, 1: 84–89.
- Fowler, H.W. 1912. The Crustacea of New Jersey. *Annual Report of the New Jersey State Museum*, 1911: 31–650.
- Miers, E.J. 1876. Catalogue of the stalk and sessile-eyed Crustacea of New Zealand. *Colonial Museum and Geological Department of New Zealand, Natural History Publication*, no. 10. xii, 133 pp.
- White, A. 1857. *A popular history of British Crustacea*. 358 pp., 20 pls. Reeve, London.